

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

**FILED**

NOV 12 2024

DEPT. OF REAL ESTATE

By

*R. P. Wade*

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

\* \* \*

In the Matter of the Accusation of

ARMANDO MIRANDA, JR.,

Respondent.

Nos. H-37351 LA & H-40698 LA

ORDER DENYING REINSTATEMENT OF LICENSE

On March 30, 2012, a Decision was rendered in Case No. H-37351 LA, revoking the real estate broker license of Respondent, but granting Respondent the right to a restricted real estate broker license, effective April 24, 2012. On September 21, 2017, a Decision was rendered in Case No. H-40698 LA revoking the real estate broker license of Respondent effective October 23, 2017.

On June 17, 2024, Respondent petitioned for reinstatement of said real estate broker license, and the Attorney General of the State of California has been given notice of the filing of said petition.

The burden of proving rehabilitation rests with the petitioner (*Feinstein v. State Bar* (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 541). A petitioner is required to show greater proof of honesty and integrity than an applicant for first time licensure. The proof must be sufficient to overcome the prior adverse judgment on the applicant's character (*Tardiff v. State Bar* (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 395).

1 I have considered the petition of Respondent and the evidence submitted in  
2 support thereof.

3 The Department has developed criteria in Section 2911 of Title 10, California  
4 Code of Regulations (Regulations) to assist in evaluating the rehabilitation of an applicant for  
5 reinstatement of a license. Among the criteria relevant in this proceeding are:

6  
7 ***2911. Criteria for Rehabilitation***

8 *(a)(10) Discharge of, or bona fide efforts toward discharging, adjudicated debts  
9 or monetary obligations to others.*

10 Respondent provided no evidence of discharging, or bona fide efforts toward  
11 discharging, any of the following monetary obligations:

- 12 - On November 21, 2023 the County of Orange filed a \$5,104 tax lien against  
13 Respondent.
- 14 - On September 12, 2019, the State of California filed a \$68,458 tax lien against  
15 Respondent.
- 16 - On July 25, 2019, the State of California filed a \$265,704 tax lien against  
17 Respondent.
- 18 - On July 20, 2015, the State of California filed a \$58,475 tax lien against  
19 Respondent.
- 20 - On December 10, 2013, the County of Orange filed a \$3,190 tax lien against  
21 Respondent.
- 22 - On June 4, 2012, a civil judgment for \$7,437 was filed against Respondent, in  
23 favor of Ramitesh Sukul.
- 24 - On August 9, 2011 a civil judgement for \$3,500 was entered against  
25 Respondent, in favor of Rosalva Sepulveda.
- 26 - On October 28, 2009, a \$48,418 federal tax lien was filed against Respondent.
- 27 - On July 7, 2008, the State of California filed a \$214,725 tax lien against  
Respondent.
- On February 28, 2008, a civil judgement for \$25,866 was entered against  
Respondent, in favor of Coldwell Banker Real Estate.
- On August 17, 2007, a civil judgement for \$254,959 was entered against  
Respondent, in favor of Coldwell Banker Real Estate.
- On March 1, 2006, a \$424,515 federal tax lien was entered against  
Respondent.

///

///

///

1                   (12)Significant or conscientious involvement in community, church or privately-  
2                   sponsored programs designed to provide social benefits or to ameliorate social  
3                   problems.

4                   Respondent submitted no evidence of significant participation in any such groups.

5                   (a)(14)Change in attitude from that which existed at the time of the conduct in  
6                   question as evidenced by the following:

7                   (B) Evidence from family members, friends and/or other persons familiar with  
8                   applicant's previous conduct and with his or her subsequent attitudes and/or  
9                   behavioral patterns.

10                  Respondent submitted no reference letters from any individuals familiar with his  
11                  prior conduct and his subsequent attitudes.

12                  Respondent has failed to demonstrate to my satisfaction that Respondent has  
13                  undergone sufficient rehabilitation to warrant the reinstatement of Respondent's real estate  
14                  broker license at this time.

15                  Given the violations found and the fact that Respondent has not established that  
16                  Respondent has satisfied Regulations 2911(a)(10), (a)(12) and (a)(14)(B), I am not satisfied that  
17                  Respondent is sufficiently rehabilitated to receive a real estate broker license.

18                  NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that Respondent's petition for  
19                  reinstatement of Respondent's real estate broker license is denied.

DEC 02 2024

20                  This Order shall become effective at 12 o'clock noon on \_\_\_\_\_

21                  IT IS SO ORDERED

11/7/2024

22                                   CHIKA SUNQUIST  
23                                   REAL ESTATE COMMISSIONER

24                                   *Marcus L. McCarther*

25                                   By: Marcus L. McCarther  
26                                   Chief Deputy Real Estate Commissioner  
27